



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,138	12/27/2001	Choon-Seng Tan	P01-3977	1621

22879 7590 01/21/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

VU, TRISHA U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2112

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/034,138	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Trisha Vu	<b>Art Unit</b> 2112	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 17 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Sumati Lefkowitz*  
**SUMATI LEFKOWITZ**  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Trisha Vu*  
Trisha Vu  
Examiner  
Art Unit: 2112

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

With respect to Applicant's arguments of claims 1 and 14 (pages 9-14 of the Remarks) that "Applicant respectfully disagrees that Herbert teaches or even contemplates "redundant controllers that attach directly to the host system's main PCI bus", first, note at least col. 4 lines 32-40 where it stated very clearly that "the present invention is applicable to RAID controllers that attach directly to the host system's main bus". Second, even considering that the host bus is only directly coupled to a single controller as argued by Applicant, it is still obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement each of the controllers of Mori to attach directly to the host PCI bus as taught by Herbert to minimize the number of buses for connecting devices and thus reduce the system cost. As addressed by the Examiner in the previous Office Action, Mori does not explicitly disclose how the active and standby controllers linked to the host bus, therefore they could directly link to the host bus or indirectly link to host bus (e.g. through several buses before reaching the host bus). Therefore, implementing each of the controllers to attach directly to the host bus reducing the number of buses for connecting. It is noted that only the teaching of "controller(s) that attach directly to the host system's bus" is brought in, this will not destroy the invention of Mori since the controllers of Mori still can communicate to each other and to the host in the way taught in Mori, the only difference now is that they are directly connected to the host bus, instead of going through a couple of buses before reaching the host bus. Regarding Applicant's arguments of claim 21 (pages 14-15 of the Remarks) that "Iswandhi teaches directly away from the limitations of claim 21 in that it teaches a processing system composed of multiple sub-processing systems", note that Mori teaches all the limitations of claim 21 except the interrupt processing between the controllers, and Iswandhi teaches how to handle interrupts between processing units and with any other I/O devices of the system (note at least the abstract), therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the interrupt processing as taught by Iswandhi in the system of Mori and Herbert to notify the destination of an event wherein the system can minimize the requirement of additional interrupt lines (col. 6 line 61 to col. 7 line 15)..